

AGENDA # 6

City of Madison, Wisconsin

REPORT OF: URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION	PRESENTED: March 2, 2011
TITLE: 416, 420, 424 West Mifflin Street – PUD(GDP-SIP) for a 44-Unit Apartment Building. 4 th Ald. Dist. (19953)	REFERRED: REREFERRED: REPORTED BACK:
AUTHOR: Alan J. Martin, Secretary	ADOPTED: POF:
DATED: March 2, 2011	ID NUMBER:

Members present were: Mark Smith, Dawn O’Kroley, Richard Slayton*, John Harrington, R. Richard Wagner, Melissa Huggins, Jay Handy and Henry Lufler, Jr.

*Slayton recused himself for this item.

SUMMARY:

At its meeting of March 2, 2011, the Urban Design Commission **GRANTED FINAL APPROVAL** of a PUD(GDP-SIP) located at 416, 420, 424 West Mifflin Street. Appearing on behalf of the project were John Bieno, representing TJK Design Build; Pat McCaughey, Max McCaughey and Scott Kolar. Bieno presented changes to the plans based on the comments from the last meeting. The modular brick has been increased in size, the fourth floor plan has been pushed back two additional feet along with placement of other features in alignment without losing any space on the interior, as well as a change of colors to match the element and softened to match other areas. The main entry door has been repositioned to give it a more traditional appearance, and the double windows have been made more symmetrical. A protruding bay has been reintroduced with transoms above, including the trellis on the right side of the front façade, in addition to relocating the stairs at the center with widening them out. In addressing Plan Commission issues, they have increased the depth of the backyard from six to eight feet, the landscape plan has been changed to incorporate a rain garden infiltration area from the patio; the brick has remained the same.

Rachel Klaven spoke as a resident of the neighborhood and expressed that she doesn’t feel this new building fits with the existing character of the neighborhood. She feels whatever is approved should set a very strong precedent to keep the character of the neighborhood.

Michael Stluka spoke as a member of the “Save Mifflin” group, asking the fourth story to be eliminated. He also spoke to the character of the neighborhood and their desire to see that continue in future development.

Ald. Verveer spoke to the contentious nature of this development and how much discussion has occurred. He requested the Urban Design Commission to articulate their position on the Plan Commission’s requirements to their motion. The Planning Division has argued that there should be more brick on a downtown building. The issue of landscaping and brick is not to be overlooked, but Verveer still has an issue with the tower. He feels this is a tremendous improvement over what is there but would like to see further modifications in order to enthusiastically vote on this.

The Chair stated he feels the modifications have greatly improved how that façade works with that tower. The question being raised about the fourth story is a separate issue from the tower with the fourth floor relating to the height of the adjacent building to the left. The porches now relate much more to the “front porch culture” of this neighborhood. The fiberboard and masonry on the building can relate to future developments. The refinements have strengthened the project.

Other Commission comments were as follows:

- Some of the problem I think is the graphic, and it looks bigger than it will feel.
- The vast improvement of these porch elements on the street cannot be undersold, along with the idea that we’re starting to get a feeling of one building here, another one here, and another one here. All of these elements help break down the scale of the building and make it very street worthy.
- Some people like the monochromatic wrapping at the top; we like it broken up.
- You still have the opportunity to look at this as an asymmetrical façade, keep the windows centered above the door, lose the window on the west side and that will push it back a little bit and create more of a focus over the entrance.
 - The issue is if we break this up into ½ a module then it starts to look like a finger, not really a good thing. After pushing and pulling this back and looking at the window configurations, this approach seemed best.
- It would be great if you had a second floor porch on the west side; that speaks to this neighborhood.

ACTION:

On a motion by Huggins, seconded by Harrington, the Urban Design Commission **GRANTED FINAL APPROVAL**. The motion was passed on a vote of (6-0) with Slayton recused.

After the Commission acts on an application, individual Commissioners rate the overall design on a scale of 1 to 10, including any changes required by the Commission. The ratings are for information only. They are not used to decide whether the project should be approved. The scale is 1 = complete failure; 2 = critically bad; 3 = very poor; 4 = poor; 5 = fair; 6 = good; 7 = very good; 8 = excellent; 9 = superior; and 10 = outstanding. The overall ratings for this project are 7, 7 and 9.

URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION PROJECT RATING FOR: 416, 420, 424 West Mifflin Street

	Site Plan	Architecture	Landscape Plan	Site Amenities, Lighting, Etc.	Signs	Circulation (Pedestrian, Vehicular)	Urban Context	Overall Rating
Member Ratings	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	7
	8	8	8	8	-	8	10	9
	6	7	7	-	-	6	7	7

General Comments:

- Glad this made it through!
- Greatly improved project from initial design.